

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

LUCIA RAMOS-QUIRARTE,
Plaintiff(s),

Case No. 2:23-cv-01778-RFB-NJK

v.

Order

STATE OF NEVADA, et al.,
Defendant(s).

13 The parties jointly requested a settlement conference, Docket No. 48, which was granted,
14 Docket No. 49 at 24.

15 In setting that settlement conference, the Court required that the settlement statements
16 include each side's opening settlement position. Docket No. 50 at 3. Both sides violated that
17 order. Plaintiff's statement included a "fair settlement amount" that the Court construed as
18 reflecting Plaintiff's opening offer given the order requiring such information. It turns out that
19 was the number at which Plaintiff wanted to end. The defense did not provide any settlement
20 number, instead falling back on the need for institutional approval¹ and indicating that their
21 settlement position would be articulated the day before the settlement conference. Of course, a
22 party is not permitted to grant itself an extension to a judicially-imposed deadline and institutional
23 parties are not entitled to preferential treatment with respect to violating orders. Adding insult to
24 injury, the defense did not provide the supplement that they indicated would be untimely
25 submitted. Hence, the Court did not have any clear understanding of the parties' settlement
26 positions until after the settlement conference began.

27
28 ¹ Counsel explained at the settlement conference that the process requires a multi-level
process up through the general counsel.

1 While violating an order is itself highly problematic, the parties' violations here also had
2 practical consequences. The violations prevented the Court from gauging whether holding a
3 settlement conference was futile and a waste of resources. Given the offers actually conveyed, it
4 is clear now that there was no point in holding the settlement conference.² Had each side complied
5 with the Court's order, at least some of the waste could have been curtailed by preemptively
6 vacating the doomed settlement conference.

7 In light of the above, the parties and all counsel of record are cautioned that they must
8 strictly comply with all orders moving forward. **Failure to do so may result in the imposition**
9 **of significant sanctions.**

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: June 11, 2025

12
13 
Nancy J. Koppe
United States Magistrate Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 ² Aside from the order violations discussed herein, it is also unclear why the parties
requested a settlement conference given the vast canyon between them.